

**2015 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2015-00838)**

**Exhibit B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
1. Attached dwelling unit provisions, RZC 21.08.260 - Item #3 in Report (O'Hara)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>6/24</u>: The Commission supported staff's recommendation, concluding that the North Redmond Neighborhood Plan is clear about how attached dwelling units should be allowed and that the Zoning Code needs to implement the plan. The Commission asked staff to advise Quadrant on what the appropriate process would be for opening up a policy discussion on attached dwelling units in North Redmond or citywide.</p> <p><u>6/10</u>: Commissioners expressed interest in having more time to review this information since it is coupled with a staff memo dated 6/10/15 that was handed out at the Commission meeting. It was agreed to spend more time reviewing this particular amendment after the public hearing on June 24<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>6/24</u>: It was recently brought to staff's attention that some language was inadvertently left out of this code section during the Zoning Code rewrite process in 2011. Staff proposes to restore code provisions that were accidentally omitted as part of the rewrite. The proposal would restore density limits for duplexes in Grass Lawn and North Redmond, restore adjacency limits for multiplexes in North Redmond, and prohibit multiplexes in the North Redmond Wedge Subarea.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>6/24</u>: Matt Perkins of Quadrant Homes testified that Quadrant believed these provisions were being rushed and did not believe there is an inconsistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code. He asked that the Commission slow down and look at impacts to growth targets and home builders. He said that Quadrant believes the proposed provisions would limit housing diversity.</p> <p><u>8/5</u>: Sandra Eisert and Kim Yates, residents of the Grass Lawn neighborhood, testified in support of the staff recommendation to restore these code provisions.</p>	Opened 6/10 Closed 6/24
2. Clarify special requirements for professional services uses in the MP zone, RZC 21.14.040.D – Item #7 in Report (Murray)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>6/24</u>: The Commission was satisfied with staff's response and closed the issue.</p> <p><u>6/10</u>: Commissioners asked for clarity on what qualifies as "other uses".</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>6/24</u>: Staff has recommended that the language be slightly modified to read that professional service uses are limited to research and development services and other uses that support another permitted</p>	Opened 6/10 Closed 6/24

**2015 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2015-00838)**

**Exhibit B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>use in the MP zone.</p> <p>In response to the Commission’s question on what qualifies as “other uses”, a variety of uses are permitted in the MP zone, such as heavy/durable consumer goods sales/service, manufacturing and wholesale trade, and freight service. All of these uses could have professional services uses related to these primary functions. “Professional services” is a defined term and includes those uses that require a high degree of professional, scientific, or technical expertise and training. As examples, professional services include accounting, tax, bookkeeping and payroll services as well as research and development services.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>3. Clarify definition of full service hotel and conference center and related provisions, RZC 21.78 – Item #25 in Report (Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>  <u>6/24</u>: The Commission was satisfied with staff’s response and closed the issue.</p> <p><u>6/10</u>: This item is not an issue but rather a clarification on how the accommodation of 300 people is measured.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>  <u>6/24</u>: Staff proposes to clarify the existing definition by stating that the full service hotel and conference center must include meeting facilities with at least one banquet or meeting room that can accommodate groups of at least 300 people.</p> <p>In response to the Commission’s measurement question, staff recommends changing the language to read, “A hotel with banquet and meeting facilities with at least one banquet or meeting room <u>having a seated occupant load of 300 people or greater.</u>”</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 6/10  Closed 6/24</p>
<p>4. Parking for conference centers and arts, entertainment and recreational uses: is “adequate for peak use” the</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>  <u>8/5</u>: The Commission was satisfied with staff’s response and closed the issue.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>  <u>8/5</u>: Most uses in the Zoning Code contain minimum and maximum parking standards. Some uses are either very broad or variable and so parking is regulated on a case-by-case basis. In those instances the applicant submits a parking study that demonstrates anticipated parking demand. Development services</p>	<p>Opened 6/24  Closed 8/5</p>

**2015 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2015-00838)**

**Exhibit B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
appropriate standard given transportation and land use goals and policies? – Item #26 and #28 in Report (Miller)	<p>staff review the study and either approve it or work with the applicant to come to agreement on anticipated parking demand.</p> <p>Conference centers are an example of a use where parking demand is variable depending on the center’s purpose and layout. The pre-2011 regulations required 10 parking stalls per 1,000 sq ft gross floor area for all “assembly” uses, which included banquet rooms. That may be appropriate for some conference centers, but may overestimate demand for others. Relying on a situation-specific study instead allows the City and applicant to tailor the requirement.</p> <p>“Arts, entertainment and recreation” is a broad category encompassing dozens of potential land uses ranging from parks where there might be no parking at all to theaters that may require significant parking. Staff does not believe it is feasible to set a parking standard for this broad category. “Adequate to accommodate peak use” is the standard language in the Zoning Code in cases like these.</p> <p>Early in the process of preparing this package of amendments staff considered changing the “peak use” to “typical use” or other language that moves away from providing parking based on peak demand. Staff discussed parking specific to parks and the current process of relying on a parking study and transportation management program. Staff believes the idea of a “typical use” standard has merit but believes it should be reviewed in the context of Redmond’s parking regulations generally.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
5. Removal of affordable housing waiver issues – Item #9 in the Report	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>8/5</u>: Although this was not an issue immediately identified by the Planning Commission, the Commission wanted to explore staff’s proposal to remove the affordable housing waiver removal in Overlake. Interest was piqued after hearing public testimony on this item. The Commission weighed the issue of affordable housing with developer expectations based on existing code and ultimately asked to bring this item back for further deliberation.</p> <p><u>8/12</u>: The Commission discussed the most recent staff proposal to leave the affordable housing waiver provisions in place. They also appreciated staff’s alternative suggestion to reduce the number of waivers from 100 to 75. After discussion, the Commission agreed to keep the waiver provision as it currently exists.</p>	Opened 8/5 Closed 8/12

**2015 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2015-00838)**

**Exhibit B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Staff Response and Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>8/5</u>: Staff initially recommended removal of the affordable housing requirement waiver for several reasons which are described in the May 29, 2015 Technical Committee Report to the Planning Commission. In summary, the waiver was established in 2007 to encourage catalyst developments in a relatively new area for multi-family development. Since then the market has shown that Overlake is an attractive location for investment and the need for affordable housing remains great in Redmond and the Eastside.</p> <p>After hearing the public testimony in opposition to staff's proposal to instead add a sunset date of December 31, 2016, staff supports retaining the original affordable housing waiver language with no sunset date in recognition of the testimony that Limited Edition has relied on this provision to attract buyers for phase 1 of the master plan and development agreement.</p> <p>Another option staff thought about and that the Commission may want to consider is a reduction in the total number of possible affordable housing waivers from 100 to 75 with no sunset date.</p> <p>So far, 25 of the possible 100 affordable housing requirement waivers have been used and staff is aware of one other company in addition to Limited Edition that is interested in the affordable housing waivers. The code limits any development site to no more than 25 waivers of those that remain.</p> <p>The allowance of 100 waivers is a larger number than other programs that have allowed up to 50 waivers. The reasoning at the time this was established was based on Overlake being a relatively new market for multi-family development in 2007. Since then, the market has shown that Overlake and nearby areas are attractive for multi-family development. Reducing the number of total affordable housing waivers from 100 to 75 would reduce the number still available to be used from 75 to 50. This approach would be consistent with the approach of supporting early development projects and would provide for more affordable housing though would reduce the number of waivers that are available.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>8/5</u>: Public testimony was presented on this issue by representatives of Koll Commerce Center Limited Edition. It was stated that the affordable housing waiver language was reaffirmed by City Council approximately a year ago and it didn't seem appropriate to remove the language or add an expiration date without a more thorough analysis. This particular client has been working with the City on preparation of a master plan and Development Agreement and has relied on this provision to attract</p>	

**2015 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2015-00838)**

**Exhibit B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	developer buyers for Phase 1 of its phased master plan. As such, they recommend the Commission not remove the affordable housing waiver language.	